

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Boron Community Services District	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$ 427,000
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Antelope Valley IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$ 427,000

---

#### PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal consists of one project with the following benefit types: water supply and water quality, Boron Community Services District (BCSD) Arsenic Management Feasibility Study and Well Design Project. This entails developing a hydrology study, preliminary engineering report, pilot well, and production well design to provide a recommended project to BCSD for arsenic management in their groundwater supply.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	3/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	18/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	4/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			47

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation and sufficient rationale. The tasks for the project are of adequate detail and completeness and it is clear that the project can be implemented; however, the problem the project addresses is not well described and it is unclear how the project alternatives were determined. Basic background information including the source of arsenic in groundwater in the area, current well construction and completion zones, and treatment technologies being considered are not included in the proposal. Additionally the applicant does not document deliverables.

##### BUDGET

The budget includes cost information but supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories; costs cannot be verified as reasonable. The applicant provides lump sums for all line items "based on previous experience with similar projects" but does not provide further explanation regarding the nature of the previous

experience or information on the similarity of projects that would allow reviewers to concur that lump sum costs are appropriate and reasonable. Based on the scope in the work plan, permitting costs seem excessive for “preliminary investigation into permitting requirements.”

## **SCHEDULE**

The schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin implementation no later than October 2014; however, the criterion is less than fully addressed and not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule for some tasks appears to be unreasonable and there are inconsistencies between the schedule, work plan, and budget. For example, the schedule depicts legal costs that extend over the course of the project, but these costs are not discussed in the budget nor are they clearly related to a task in the work plan. The budget provides a cost associated with permitting, but permitting is not included in the schedule. Additionally the schedule narrative includes implementation of environmental mitigation measures but the work plan and budget state that no mitigation measures will be needed.

## **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The measurement tools and methods provided in Table 6-1 are products of project implementation and will not monitor project performance and progress in meeting project goals. The identified targets are actions that will be implemented and, thus, are not appropriate monitoring targets for project benefits.

## **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and physical benefits are not well described. The project will complete a feasibility study to evaluate four alternatives to address Arsenic impacted drinking water supply. It is understood that the full degree of benefits cannot be calculated until the feasibility study is conducted. The applicant does not provide any data to backup assertions regarding improved groundwater quality, reduced energy requirements, or estimated new well production rate. For example, the applicant does not discuss how much water supply is currently being used and in need of treatment and compare it with a range of expected supply to be produced using the alternatives. This would have provided reviewers with more insight as to whether the proposed alternatives would be sufficient to address the water supply concerns. The applicant cites documents but does not provide them or any excerpted information in the application; therefore the technical justification lacks documentation.

## **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.

The planning/design project would include a Preliminary Engineering Report that provides analysis of four alternatives to manage arsenic concentrations. A cost-effectiveness analysis is provided which shows that the proposed project is likely to identify the most cost effective way to meet water quality (arsenic) requirements. Depending on the alternative selected, the project might also reduce State Water Project imports. The quality of this work is good; however, the study by itself cannot provide physical and economic benefits. There are no assurances that one of the alternatives will be implemented; however, it seems very likely. The application does not explain when and how the selected alternative will be financed and implemented.

## **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims that five program preferences and five statewide priorities would be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates a high degree of certainty, and provides adequate documentation for three of the

preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; and (3) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.